REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 1, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 3 are independent claims. In this paper, claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended to address informalities noted by the Examiner. Additionally, claims 5-11 have been amended to depend from one of claims 1 and 3 and, as such, are believed to be entitled to consideration based on their dependency. No new matter has been added. The application as now presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

I. Summary of Telephone Conference with Examiner

First, Applicants' representatives appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Cao in granting and conducting a telephone conference on August 9, 2007. Applicants were represented at the interview by attorney Joseph Teja and Technology Specialist Andrew Tibbetts. During the telephone conference, Applicants' representatives discussed the publication and filing dates of U.S. Patent No. 6,827,278 ("Timm") and confirmed that Timm is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). No discussion of the claims, the subject matter of the application, or substantive aspects of the Timm reference took place during the telephone conference.

II Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In addition to the passage previously cited from Applicants' specification (page 2, lines 20-22), Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to page 2, lines 14-16, of the specification as filed, which reads: "According to an embodiment of the present invention, the total power provided to the calculation element in the time window is determined according to the maximum possible power consumption of the calculation element." Applicants again respectfully submit that determining a maximum possible power consumption of calculation element is well within the abilities of one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, with respect to claim 2, the specification is believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph one, and accordingly the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3 to adopt the suggestions provided by the Examiner for addressing the noted indefiniteness issues. Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,827,278 ("Timm"). Having amended the claims purely to correct informalities as noted above, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Timm does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1. For example, Timm does not teach "*randomly* distributing, in a predetermined time window, an instantaneous supply power to the asynchronous calculation element."

Instead, Timm relates to an optimal distribution of a limited amount of power to ***multiple*** asynchronous logic components of a data processing unit to ensure that all of the asynchronous logic components complete operations without requiring more power than can be supplied (Timm, col. 5, lines 27-31). Timm teaches that by using asynchronous components and **not** controlling the power supplied to the components of the data processing unit, the unit may "make optimum use of the electrical energy made available" (col. 5, lines 32-33). Timm further teaches that "this means that the data processing unit should always take up exactly as much electrical energy as can be supplied via the relevant active interface, so that no oversupply of electrical energy should occur at any instant" (col. 5, lines 33-39).

In contrast to Timm, claim 1 recites "randomly distributing, in a predetermined time window, an instantaneous supply power to the asynchronous calculation element." Nowhere in the reference does Timm disclose or suggest anything relating to a random distribution of power to an asynchronous element. The only teaching in Timm of any random event or process concerns the randomness of execution times produced by multiple asynchronous logic components (col. 9, lines 15-16). Timm states that such random execution times results in a statistically uniformly distributed operation so that a uniform energy consumption by all of the multiple components is realized (col. 9, lines 16-22). This concept is wholly unrelated, however, to the manner in which power is provided to any particular asynchronous element; specifically, a uniform energy consumption by multiple asynchronous components in no way teaches or suggests a random power distribution to any one asynchronous element.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Timm and is in allowable condition. Claims 2 and 5-7 depend from claim 1 and, based on their dependency, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

For reasons that should be appreciated from the foregoing discussion of claim 1, Timm does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 3. For example, claim 3 recites "a variable supply element configured to randomly distribute in a predetermined time window an instantaneous energy provided to the asynchronous calculation element." Timm is completely silent with respect to randomly distributing an instantaneous energy provided to an asynchronous element. Therefore, claim 3 patentably distinguishes Timm and is in allowable condition. Claims 4 and 8-11 depend from claim 3 and, based on their dependency, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2007

By: _____

Joseph Teja, Jr.
Registration No.: 45,157
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000